



# SCOPING COMMENT SUMMARY

The CALFED Program EIS/R scoping period ran from April 8 through May 20, 1996. More than 700 Californians confronted Bay-Delta problems at nine events in April and May including 7 scoping meetings, Workshop 6, and a public meeting in Los Banos. Listed below are the dates, locations and numbers of people who attended the meetings and Workshop.

Date	Location/Event	Attendance
April 8	Oakland/Scoping	47 people
April 9	Walnut Grove/Scoping	37 people
April 10	Red Bluff/Scoping	84 people
April 15	Sacramento/Scoping	37 people
April 15	Sacramento/Workshop 6	250 people
April 16	San Diego/Scoping	39 people
April 17	Long Beach/Scoping	23 people
April 17	Pasadena/Scoping	25 people
April 18	Bakersfield/Scoping	80 people
May 6	Los Banos/Public Meeting	110 people
	9 Events	732 people

Most of the comments provided constructive criticism of the 10 alternatives and the process used to develop the proposed Bay-Delta solutions. Agricultural representatives argued against significant land fallowing. Some environmental interests requested more detail on ecosystem restoration goals, while urban water users asked for water quality assurances. At Workshop 6, additional issues, such as key information sources, financial approaches, and CEQA and NEPA considerations were discussed. The **Workshop 6 Summary** portion of this packet provides more detail on the additional discussion topics.

---

## SCOPING COMMENT SUMMARY

Continued

Oral comments were generally consistent with comments contained in the over 160 letters received by the Program. The hundreds of comments from the workshop, meetings, and letters are synthesized below by component category to identify key emerging themes and issues. By no means comprehensive, this list highlights significant issues identified as needing to be addressed during the refinement of the alternatives. A complete scoping comment document will be available from Program staff in late June 1996.

### General Water Supply

1. The alternatives do not appear to increase overall supply of water. The Program must clearly show how alternatives will increase the opportunity to move, store, and use more water.
2. The issue of the integrity of the common pool concept must be addressed. Many believe that the common pool approach should be retained and expressed concern that any portion of flow redirected through an isolated facility would undermine this concept. Others suggest that some flow might be isolated without jeopardizing the common pool provided assurances are iron-clad.
3. Area of origin concerns must be considered as alternatives are proposed and impacts analyzed.

### Ecosystem Restoration

1. Clarify and elaborate the Program's vision for ecosystem restoration. Provide additional definitions, goals and objectives. A fully developed Ecosystem Restoration Plan should be part of all the alternatives.
2. The Program needs to expand watershed management and actions as part of the overall effort.
3. The Program should more explicitly show how it is treating the need for increases in critical Delta outflow and the need for additional instream flows for the benefit of fish and wildlife. This concept should be explicit in the Ecosystem Restoration Plan.
4. Ecosystem restoration will entail changes in current land uses and configurations. Resulting impacts to existing habitats and current economic uses of those lands must be predicted and thoroughly analyzed.

---

## SCOPING COMMENT SUMMARY

Continued

5. The Program needs to address the concerns of commentors who believe that the Program fails to provide benefits in core and essential actions to other areas aside from ecosystem restoration. Benefits in system vulnerability, water quality, and water supply reliability need to be brought into better focus.

### Water Quality

1. Reduction of pollutants at the source should be a core action.
2. The alternatives need to clarify how each will seek to obtain the best source of water for end users' needs. Public health requirements must be explicitly addressed as part of the assumptions which guide alternative development.
3. The mere dilution of pollutant elements will not satisfy the objective of improving water quality.
4. Alternatives must clearly express how each will address salt and chemical recirculation problems now associated with Delta water.
5. The Program needs to address the San Joaquin drainage issue.
6. The Program must address potential water quality impacts of various facility and non-facility proposals. A common pool proposal may have water quality impacts to south of Delta users; an isolated facility may have impacts to in-Delta users. Any alternative which degrades Delta water quality must not be chosen.
7. Degradation of water quality, when water is transported through the Delta, affects the ability of urban agencies to recycle water.
8. Disinfection by-products resulting from bromides in Delta water are a concern.
9. Improve and augment water quality actions in all alternatives.

---

## SCOPING COMMENT SUMMARY

Continued

### Conveyance

1. Dual and through Delta conveyance options protect Delta water quality. Explain how an isolated facility be will be implemented to protect quality in the Delta.
2. Regional flood control issues should be described in all conveyance options.
3. Analyze the seismic vulnerability of facilities.
4. Discuss isolation of drinking water for the dual conveyance option.
5. Discuss water transfers and potential impacts.
6. Discuss the need to remove Delta constraints before storage can be effective.

### Storage

1. Discuss, as a high priority, expanding existing storage (raise dams).
2. Prioritize conjunctive use first, then groundwater banking.

### Water Use Efficiency

1. Water use efficiency should be a stronger theme and part of every alternative.
2. Land retirement elements of alternatives must be reconsidered. Current ranges in alternatives could have major redirected impacts and therefore may not meet solution principles. Re-think land fallowing vs. retirement. Evaluate the potential for third-party impacts, and re-evaluate the total number of acres proposed as part of willing seller buy-out program.
3. Recognize the difference between long-term conservation and shortage measures.
4. Water use efficiency needs to be preserved as a local implementation item.

---

## SCOPING COMMENT SUMMARY

Continued

### System Vulnerability

1. A greater level of levee stabilization (such as the PL 99 Standard) should be implemented in each alternative.
2. Many parties expressed support for an enhanced levee stabilization program.
3. Flood control measures in the North Delta need to be included in all alternatives.

### Institutional Guarantees and Assurances

1. The Program needs to develop guarantees so that the ecosystem actions will be effective.
2. The Program needs to develop mechanisms to link the Program components in ways which ensure that all parties will eventually achieve the desired benefit, even in cases when one component is staged before another component.

### Conclusions on Refining the Alternatives

These themes led to modifying the 10 alternative Bay Delta solutions:

- the need for extensive levels of water use efficiency,
- a high quality of source water for urban water suppliers,
- a high level of Delta levee protection, and
- a single coherent vision for ecosystem restoration.

How these themes, in combination with evaluation of alternatives against the Solution Principles, focused the alternative refinement process and modified the alternatives is explained in the **Introduction to the Alternatives**.

---

# WORKSHOP 6 SUMMARY

## INTRODUCTION

### Meeting Participants and Purpose

Over 200 people attended Workshop 6, held at the Clarion Hotel in downtown Sacramento on April 15, 1996. Participants represented a wide range of public and private interests including resource management agencies, utility districts, Delta and Central Valley water and irrigation districts, rural community and agricultural interests, urban water districts, local governments, power companies, environmental groups, CALFED Program staff, and consultants. The purpose of the workshop was to assess the ten alternatives that were described in the Workshop packet. Workshop participants discussed the strengths and weaknesses of each alternative, determined which components worked well together, and proposed alternative changes or deletions. Program staff incorporated input received from the Workshop into the programmatic EIS/R scoping process and refinement of the draft alternatives.

### Workshop Agenda

During the first session Lester Snow reviewed the key steps to producing the ten alternatives. An overview of the alternatives and a detailed review of alternative components and operational strategies followed the opening presentation. After lunch, workshop participants divided into seven breakout sessions to discuss the alternatives. In the last section, the group reconvened for the closing plenary to wrap up discussions from the breakout sessions.

### Format of This Summary

This brief summary focuses on major topics and public input from the workshop. A complete summary will be available at Workshop 7 or by calling Mary Kelley at (916) 657-2666 .

Questions and comments expressed by workshop participants complemented many scoping comments and were incorporated into the **Scoping Comment Summary** section of this packet. In addition, advice given by workshop participants and others helped to refine the ten Phase I alternatives to the draft Phase II alternatives.

---

**Workshop 6 Summary**  
Continued

**PLENARY SESSION DISCUSSIONS**

**Key Information Consulted Throughout the Process**

Staff informed participants that they developed an extensive list of relevant resource documents and incorporated information from the documents into the alternatives.

**Financing Strategies and Cost Estimates**

Workshop participants and Program staff engaged in an informative discussion on the methods for estimating costs of alternatives. The first steps in the financial strategy are to identify benefits of implementing components and define related costs. After designating the Phase II draft alternatives and estimating costs and benefits, the strategy is to assign benefits, allocate costs, and determine revenue tools.

Currently, the Program has estimated total capital expenses of proposed projects, only. Annualized capital costs, operating and maintenance costs, and socio-economic costs (such as water transfer impacts) will be explored in Phase II. The Program is estimating these expenses as accurately as possible and anticipates a small (15%) chance that costs will exceed the estimates. Because projects and programs will be expensive, the financial strategy proposes spreading costs over time by staging implementation of alternative components.

The financial strategy calls for a modified cost/benefit analysis that will follow a least-cost approach. This approach will assess the costs of improvements and benefits of reducing problems to determine the solution with the smallest overall costs.

**Evaluating Alternatives**

Discussion touched briefly on the Program's approach to preparation of the EIS/R. NEPA and CEQA require analysis of alternatives that are technically and economically practical or feasible. The Phase II alternative solutions will be compared to current environmental conditions, also known as "existing conditions" or "affected environment," and the no-action alternative. The Program will assess costs of the no-action alternative or foregone opportunities (following the strategy outlined above) during detailed analysis in Phase II.

**General Alternative Refinement and Implementation Issues**

Staff explained that screening out of components will be based on comments from stakeholders and staff analysis of fundamental problems with an approach. Political interests and concerns will not be used as criteria for eliminating an alternative. After the Bay-Delta solution is selected, the Program expects implementation to continue to the year 2030.



---

## Workshop 6 Summary

Continued

### Breakout Session Discussions

The breakout sessions had three objectives:

- ~ To ask questions and receive responses regarding the process and alternatives.
- ~ To provide comments on alternatives.
- ~ To provide advice to CALFED staff on refining alternatives.

Many questions and comments were repeated in scoping meetings and letters. Because much of the information from the workshop is incorporated in the **Scoping Comment Summary** section and the full workshop summary, only a brief list of key issues is provided below.

### Key Issues/Advice to Staff

- Clarify the process for refining alternatives.
- Re-visit the solution and problem scope statement.
- Develop more detailed baseline information.
- Clarify operational criteria.
- More time is needed to review alternatives. Provide the level of information needed to ensure stakeholder understanding of issues, while considering the Program timeline.

### Issues Related Components and Alternatives

- Demand management should be a stronger theme throughout all alternatives. Re-think the proposed agricultural land retirement approach.
- Increase importance of watershed management in alternatives.
- Clarify the ecosystem restoration vision.
- Provide more storage options. Prioritize storage alternatives; begin with conjunctive use.
- Propose greater levee stabilization improvements.
- Propose improved water quality/management options.
- Alternatives need more flexibility to increase durability.
- Broader ranges for sizes of facilities and restoration will provide more flexibility.
- Consider new combinations of components.

---

## Workshop 6 Summary

Continued

### Suggested Topics for Future Workshops and Meetings

- **Cost.** How are costs being estimated? What are operational & maintenance costs? How will staging and revenue sources affect affordability? Which sectors (public or private) benefit from specific components and alternatives? What are the total costs of alternatives?
- **Effectiveness of components.** What will be the outcome of implementing components, either individually or in combination?
- **Assurances.** With what certainty can the expected outcomes of components be assured, especially for water supply, yield, quality and habitat restoration? What are the institutional guarantees that ensure effectiveness of a Bay-Delta solution?
- **Other Related Processes.** What is the relationship between the CALFED and CVPIA EIS's?
- **Core Actions.** How are they different from essential elements? How are they implemented and financed?
- **No-Project Alternative.** How will the alternative be defined and what projects will it contain?
- **Other Proposed Topics.** Support was expressed for more public discussion on levee stabilization, ecosystem restoration and water yield.

### KEY WORKSHOP OUTCOMES

Several decisions and commitments were made at the Workshop that are helping to guide the Program to the end of Phase I and beginning of Phase II.

- A full reference list/bibliography of information sources consulted for developing and refining alternatives will be available from the Program at the end of Phase I. A draft list was provided at the workshop.
- BDAC Work Group meetings are open to the public. The Finance and Ecosystem Restoration work groups were of particular interest to several workshop participants. They and other members of the public were advised to contact Program staff for meeting dates and locations.

---

## Workshop 6 Summary

Continued

- Workshop discussions became part of the scoping record. A separate, comprehensive scoping document, including comments from the workshop, scoping and public meetings, and Program responses will be available from the CALFED Program office in late June.
- Workshop 7 will focus on the draft Phase II alternatives and components which make up the alternatives. The cross-cutting issues listed under **Suggested Topics for Future Meetings and Workshops** will be discussed in public meetings and workshops, starting in July. A calendar of future CALFED events is included in this packet. A more comprehensive calendar will be available at Workshop 7.